

Poesia, musica e agoni nella Grecia antica

Poetry, Music and Contests in ancient Greece

Atti del IV convegno internazionale di ΜΟΙΣΑ
Proceedings of the IVth International Meeting of ΜΟΙΣΑ
Lecce, 28-30 ottobre 2010

a cura di D. CASTALDO - F.G. GIANNACHI - A. MANIERI

RUDIAE
RICERCHE SUL MONDO CLASSICO

22-23

2010-2011

I Tomo



CONGEDO EDITORE

ALEXANDER DALE

Dithyramb, Tragedy, and Callimachus:
the New Music and its Reception*

* This paper develops material in a chapter of my Oxford DPhil thesis (2009), supervised by Adrian Hollis and Gregory Hutchinson. Any errors or infelicities are entirely my own.

Much has been written—and justifiably so—about Callimachus’ reaction to and interaction with earlier poetry, from Homer and Hesiod, Mimnermus, Hipponax, and Pindar, through to the poets of Old Comedy. Likewise a great deal has been written, perhaps less justifiably, about Callimachus’ relation to Hellenistic historical epic, a subject about which we know far less than the bibliography on it would lead one to believe.¹ The purpose of the present paper is to consider if, and if so how, Callimachus reacted to the ‘popular’ poetry performed in the theatres and at the festivals of the post-Classical and Hellenistic world. I begin by examining the developments in music and poetry associated with the poets of the New Music,² which were to have a profound and lasting influence on many of the most popular genres of performance poetry in the fourth and third centuries. Following upon this I turn to various passages in Callimachus which, in the light of the preceding discussion, might shed light on how Callimachus viewed much of the poetry that was still to be heard throughout the Greek world in his own day.

Pherecrates³ famously presents personified Music complaining to personified Justice about her recent ravaging at the hands of several contemporary poets:

(ΜΟΥΣΙΚΗ.) λέξω μὲν οὐκ ἄκουσα· σοί τε γὰρ κλύειν
ἐμοί τε λέξαι θυμὸς ἡδονὴν ἔχει.
ἐμοί γὰρ ἤρξε τῶν κακῶν Μελανιππίδης,
ἐν τοῖσι πρῶτος ὃς λαβὼν ἀνῆκέ με
χαλερωτέραν τ’ ἐποίησε χορδαῖς δώδεκα.
ἀλλ’ οὖν ὅμως οὗτος μὲν ἦν ἀποχρῶν ἀνὴρ
ἔμοιγε <— — —> πρὸς τὰ νῦν κακά.
Κινησίας δέ <μ’> ὁ κατάρατος Ἀττικός,
ἐξαρμονίους καμπὰς ποιῶν ἐν ταῖς στροφαῖς,
ἀπολώλεχ’ οὕτως, ὥστε τῆς ποιήσεως
τῶν διθυράμβων, καθάπερ ἐν ταῖς ἀσπίσιν,

¹ On these epics, and their place in discussions of Callimachus’ literary ‘program’, see CAMERON 1995, pp. 263–302.

² See generally WEST 1992, pp. 356–385; PICKARD-CAMBRIDGE 1927, pp. 38–58. See also SCHÖNEWOLF 1938. For the ancient testimonia see CAMPBELL, *Greek Lyric* V.

³ Fr. 155 *PCG*. Ph.’s authorship is more likely than that of Nicomachus, cfr. PICKARD-CAMBRIDGE 1927, p. 39, n. 1. Regarding his date the only solid information we have is the mention of a victory in 437 BC, *IG* II², 2325, 56; 122 = T 5–6 *PCG*.

ἀριστέρ' αὐτοῦ φαίνεται τὰ δεξιά.
 ἀλλ' οὖν ἀνεκτὸς οὗτος ἦν ὅμως ἐμοί.
 Φρῦνις δ' ἴδιον στρόβιλον ἐμβαλὼν τινα
 κάμπτων με καὶ στρέφων ὅλην διέφθορεν,
 ἐν πέντε χορδαῖς δῶδεχ' ἁρμονίας ἔχων.
 ἀλλ' οὖν ἐμοιγε χούτος ἦν ἀποχρῶν ἀνὴρ·
 εἰ γάρ τι καζήμαρτεν, αὖθις ἀνέλαβεν.
 ὁ δὲ Τιμόθεός μ', ὦ φιλτάτη, κατορώρυχε
 καὶ διακέκναικ' αἴσχιστα. (ΔΙΚΑΙΟΣ.) ποῖος οὗτος;
 <ὁ> Τιμόθεος; (Μ.) Μιλήσιός τις πυρρίας.
 κακὰ μοι παρέσχεν οὗτος, ἅπαντας οὓς λέγω
 παρελήλυθεν, ἄγων ἐκτραπέλους μυρμηκιάς.
 κἂν ἐντύχη πού μοι βαδιζούσῃ μόνῃ,
 ἀπέδυσσε κἀνέλυσε χορδαῖς δῶδεκα...
 ἐξαρμονίους ὑπερβολαίους τ' ἀνοσίους
 καὶ νιγλάρους, ὥσπερ τε τὰς ῥαφάνους ὅλην
 καμπῶν με κατεμέστωσε.

(Music). I am happy to speak, for you will take pleasure in hearing and I in telling. It was Melanippides who began my troubles: he was the first of them: he took me and pulled me down and left me looser with his twelve strings. But he was all right compared with my present troubles: Cinesias on the other hand, that damned Athenian, has so damaged me with the exharmonic twists he makes within his strophes that just as in shields you can't tell his right from his left when he composes his dithyrambs. But he was bearable all the same: Phrynīs on the other hand thrust in a peg of his own and by twisting me and turning me made a complete wreck of me, with a dozen tunings on five strings. But he was all right with me, for if he did make a mistake, he corrected it again. Timotheus on the other hand, my dear, dug me deep and ruined me shamefully. (Justice). Which Timotheus is this? (Music). A red-haired Milesian. *He* brought me trouble, far worse than all those others, with his outlandish ant-runs; and if he met me walking somewhere on my own, he striped me and slackened me with his twelve strings; . . . exharmonic, high-pitched, unholy trills, and filled me full of wrigglers like a cabbage. (Trans. Campbell)

Melanippides⁴ was the first offender, we are told, whose main innova-

⁴ Fr. 757–766 PMG. The *Suda* tells us that there were two poets by this name, and that it was the grandson of the elder Melanippides with whom these innovations are associated. However RHODE 1878, pp. 213–214 argued that there was just one Melanippides, active from ca. 480 BC to sometime after 454. This however is surely far too early a date for a poet who was ridiculed for novelty in late 5th century comedy (even if he did die as late as 413 [cf. PICKARD-CAMBRIDGE 1927, p. 40], for which there is no evidence except for the statement that he died at the court of Perdiccas). Marcellinus, *Vit. Thuc.* 29, tells us that Melanippides was a contemporary of Thucydides, Plato Comicus, and Agathon,

tion—one that is of particular consequence for the development of later lyric—was the substitution of ἀναβολαί—musical interludes—for antistrophes.⁵ Another feature of the new music was καμπαί, ‘bends’, a term which seems to have meant the modulation from one *harmonia* to another,⁶ a feature associated with Cinesias, Philoxenus, and Timotheus.⁷ Above and beyond developments in harmonic dissonance and anabolic interludes, a number of technical developments related to the instruments themselves are attested for the period, of which the most important is the increased number of strings for the *cithara* (possibly as many as twelve), which gave musical virtuosi much greater range for experimentation than the older types that had at most seven strings.⁸

Connected to, and presumably born out of, these various developments was the increasing dominance in lyric performance of the musical virtuoso.⁹ An idea of the prominence of the instrumentalist, and the consequent marginalisation of the words, is given by Ps. Plutarch, *Mus.* 1141d:

τὸ γὰρ παλαιόν, ἔως εἰς Μελανιππίδην τὸν τῶν διθυράμβων ποιητὴν, συμβεβήκει τοὺς ἀλλητὰς παρὰ τῶν ποιητῶν λαμβάνειν τοὺς μισθοὺς, πρωταγωνιστοῦσης δηλονότι τῆς ποιήσεως, τῶν δ’ ἀλλητῶν ὑπερετούντων τοῖς διδασκάλοις. ὕστερον δὲ καὶ τοῦτο διεφθάρη . . .

For formerly, up to the time of the dithyrambic poet Melanippides, it had been the custom for the auletes to receive their pay from the poets, the words evidently playing the major role, and the auletes were subordinated to the producers; but later this practice also was abandoned . . .

The fragments of the exponents of the New Music seem to bear out the image of a poetry whose aural impression was tantamount, and for which the new poets were ridiculed in comedy.¹⁰ Compound adjectives are om-

which would make him active from some time in the 2nd half of the 5th century onwards, and thus would seem more in keeping with his role as elder contemporary to the innovators of late 5th and early 4th century lyric.

⁵ Aristot. *Rhet.* 1409b 24–27 = Mel. T 4 CAMPBELL.

⁶ Cfr. BARKER 1983, p. 94; WEST 1992, p. 356.

⁷ Cinesias at Pherecrates 155, 8–13 PCG; Σ EM Aristoph. *Nub.* 333a says it is these three poets whom Aristophanes has in mind when speaking of the κυκλίων τε χορῶν ἄσματοκάμπτας. On Timotheus see generally HORDERN 2002.

⁸ For *citharae* with seven strings in the Classical period cfr. Ion of Chios fr. 32 IEG²; Aristoph. fr. 467 PCG (from *Ποίησις*, which is obviously aimed at the New Music): οὐχ οἷα πρῶτον ἦδον ἐπτάχορδα πάνθ’ ὁμοῦα. On the development of the *cithara* see WEST 1992, pp. 49–70 and 356–357.

⁹ Cfr. FANTUZZI and HUNTER 2004, pp. 20–21.

¹⁰ Aside from the fragment from Pherecrates’ *Chiron* cited above (155 PCG), there are a number of passages in Aristophanes where various contemporary poets are parodied, cfr. par-

nipresent,¹¹ reaching their apogee in Timotheus and Philoxenus; one can only imagine the sound of such language being delivered in a poem veering between the hypodorian and mixolydian modes, replete with exharmonic bends. It was doubtless against these innovators that the proverb *καὶ διθυράμβων νοῦν ἔχεις ἐλάττονα*, ‘you have less sense than a dithyramb’, was directed.¹²

These developments were not without serious effect. For the reactionary Plato they were a sign of louche morals;¹³ for poets it presented a different problem (or, as so often, opportunity). Whereas previously each contextually determined genre had had its own proper harmony and melody, now that all harmonies and melodies could be interwoven into the same composition, generic boundaries were becoming blurred and malleable; dirges were blended with hymns and paeans with dithyrambs, which would necessarily lead to the divorcing of composition, context, and occasion.¹⁴ Perhaps here we already see the ground for Alexandrian generic crossing being laid.¹⁵

Hand in hand with these developments in music came a change in the metrical structures used in lyric poetry. Melanippides’ greatest innovation in the dithyramb, as mentioned above, was the substitution of ἀναβολαί (‘intermezzos’, to use West’s term, 1992, p. 357) for antistrophes. Without a balancing antistrophe a composition can have no responsion, and without responsion the traditional structure of choral performance poetry as it had been known for centuries was lost.¹⁶ This new-found structural

ticularly Av. 1372–1409 on Cinesias. Athenaeus (12, 551a) tells us Strattis wrote a whole play directed against Cinesias, fr. 17 *PCG*, an idea of which might be given at Σ VValt.EΘBarb Aristoph. *Ran.* 404a = fr. 16 *PCG* Στράτις ἐν τῷ εἰς αὐτὸν δράματι ἔφη· σκηνὴ μὲν < > τοῦ χοροκτόνου Κνησίου, ‘the stage . . . of Cinesias the chorus-killer.’

¹¹ Cfr. SEAFORD 1977–1978, p. 88, who lists compound epithets and periphrasis among the characteristic features of later fifth-century dithyramb. See however the judicious comments of Hamilton 1990, pp. 214–215, who notes that many of Seaford’s examples are drawn from fragments not actually attested as dithyrambs, and who suggests (rightly, I think) that this is rather to be seen a general feature of late fifth-century lyric. On the language of dithyramb cfr. Plat. *Crat.* 409c; Hor. *Carm.* 4, 2, 10.

¹² Σ RVEFMLh Aristoph. Av. 1392 = fr. adesp. 843 *PCG*.

¹³ *Leg.* 667c–670a; Plato’s sentiment was echoed a few years later by Aristoxenus *ap. Ps. Plut. Mus.* 1140d–f; cfr. WEST 1992, pp. 369–370.

¹⁴ Cfr. Plat. *Leg.* 700d–e. A paradigmatic example of generic inversion in Philodamus’ *Paeon to Dionysus* (*CA* pp. 65–71).

¹⁵ This is not to say that performance context had become meaningless by the mid 4th century, as the (? apocryphal) story of Aristotle’s prosecution for his *Hymn to Virtue* (*PMG* 842) should remind us.

¹⁶ The continuity of lyric style, in this case citharody, is indicated by *Ps. Plut. Mus.* 1133b ἡ μὲν κατὰ Τέρπανδρον κιθαρωδία καὶ μέχρι τῆς Φρύνιδος ἡλικίας παντελῶς ἀπλή τις οὔσα διετέλει.

freedom afforded the poet a much greater degree of metrical freedom.¹⁷ Polymetry comes to characterize many of the compositions of Timotheus, Philoxenus, and others.¹⁸ Furthermore, the presence of these ἀναβολαί, which allowed a more expressive vocal style to develop,¹⁹ is indicative of the increasing prominence of star performers we find in this period.²⁰ Yet another feature associated with the New Music, which might well be related to the new prominence of star performers and astrophic composition,²¹ is the increasingly mimetic function of chorus and soloist attested for the period.²² Ps. Aristotle tells us of a representation of a storm at sea in one of Timotheus' dithyrambs, amongst other things. Later sources, perhaps drawing on fourth-century accounts, refer to Philoxenus' *Cyclops* as a drama.²³ We begin to be told about the shoes and cloaks worn by instrumentalists.²⁴

Nor was the use of the modes of Greek music immune from the changes taking place in other branches of the poet / musician's art. The modes were relatively few; for the archaic and classical period the most prominent were the Dorian, Phrygian, Lydian, Aeolic, and Ionian.²⁵ Thus no one mode is exclusively associated with a particular *eidos* of poetry; rather the *mood* of the respective modes was felt to be appropriate to cer-

¹⁷ Cfr. WEST 1992, p. 215, who comments 'as the melody was not bound to a recurring strophic scheme, it could be shaped throughout to express every pictorial aspect or emotional nuance of the words'.

¹⁸ Cfr. Heph. 64, 24 – 65, 2 CONSBRUCH (*Poem.* 3 [3]) ἀπολελυμένα δέ, ἃ εἰκῇ γέγραπται καὶ ἄνευ μέτρου ὀρισμένου, οἷοί εἰσιν οἱ κιθαρωδικοὶ Τιμοθέου. See further WEST 1983, pp. 138–139, and HORDERN 2002, pp. 55–60. Another example of polymetric song at Ps. Arion, *PMG* 939, with WEST 1982, pp. 5–9. Dactylo-epitrite, much of it astrophic, was also common in a wide range of fourth-century poetry, from Philoxenus of Leucas' *Deipnon* (*PMG* 836) to Aristotle's *Hymn to Virtue* (*PMG* 842).

¹⁹ See WEST 1992, p. 358.

²⁰ For the fame attendant upon the great citharodes and aulodes of the period, indicated by, *inter alia*, the prizes awarded for these categories in inscribed victor lists, see WEST 1992, pp. 366–368.

²¹ Ps. Aristotle (see next note) associates astrophism with mimesis, cfr. WEST 1992, p. 364.

²² Most explicitly at Ps. Aristot. *Probl.* 918b 13–29. Cfr. Aristotle's account of Timotheus' and Philoxenus' representation of Cyclopes on stage at *Poet.* 1448a 13–15.

²³ See WEST 1992, pp. 365–366, citing Aristot. *Poet.* 1448a 14, Didymus in Dem. *Phil.* 12, 60, p. 46 PEARSON-STEPHENS. Cfr. FANTUZZI and HUNTER 2004, p. 20.

²⁴ *Suda* s.v. Ἀντιγενίδης (α 2657 ADLER); WEST 1992, p. 367.

²⁵ For the modes see WEST 1992, pp. 177–189, WINNINGTON-INGRAM 1936. Attestation of the Aeolic mode seems to disappear after Pindar (*Nem.* 3, 79 with Σ); as West observes (1992, p. 183 with n. 90), this suggests that it either went out of use, or that it came to be known by another name.

tain types of poetry.²⁶ The Dorian mode, for example, was very versatile, as well as one of the most common, being often found in prosodia, paeans, and tragedy.²⁷ The Lydian mode was considered ‘slack’ by Plato (μαλακαὶ . . . ἄρμονίαι, *Resp.* 398e), and suited to sympotic singing (which one supposes indicates that it was the (or an) appropriate mode for the σκόλιον). Some modes, such as the Ionian, were used in varying and seemingly conflicting compositions. Plato considers the Ionian to be ‘slack’, and groups it with the Lydian;²⁸ Heraclides Ponticus however says that it is a suitable mode for tragedy (fr. 163 WEHRLI), and it was also used in Asiatic laments.²⁹

The Phrygian mode was, like the Dorian, suited to a wide variety of contexts. One form of poetry particularly associated with this mode however was the dithyramb, as a remarkable story about Philoxenus illustrates. Aristotle tells us that Philoxenus tried to write a dithyramb in the Dorian mode, but was forced back into the appropriate Phrygian mode by the nature of the genre, *Pol.* 1342b 8 = Philox. fr. 826 *PMG* Φιλόξενος ἐγχειρήσας ἐν τῇ δωριστὶ ποιῆσαι διθύραμβον τοὺς Μύσους οὐχ οἷός τ’ ἦν, ἀλλ’ ὑπὸ τῆς φύσεως αὐτῆς ἐξέπεσεν εἰς τὴν φρυγιστὶ τὴν προσήκουσαν ἁρμονίαν πάλιν, ‘Philoxenus attempted to compose his dithyramb the *Mysians* in the Dorian mode, but was unable to do so, and was forced back into the appropriate Phrygian mode by the nature of the genre’. As WEST 1992, p. 364 says, ‘this sounds like a rather tenden-

²⁶ And indeed could be a critical generic marker for a composition; for the greater importance of mode over metre in determining generic affiliation compare the characteristics of the dithyramb as listed by CRUSIUS (*RE* s.v. dithyrambos) and HARVEY 1955, p. 73. The Phrygian mode is a necessary constituent, as is *aulos* (and later *cithara*) accompaniment; metre is not. In this context cfr. the activity of Apollonius the Eidographer, who (it seems) attempted to classify poetic texts in the Alexandrian library by their respective modes, *Et. Mag.* 295, 52 ff. GAISFORD: εἰδογράφος· Ἀπολλώνιος εἰδογράφος, ἐπειδὴ εὐφυῆς ὢν ἐν τῇ βιβλιοθήκῃ τὰ εἶδη τοῖς εἵδεσιν ἐπένειμεν. τὰς γὰρ δοκούσας τῶν εἰδῶν (ὡδῶν Sylburg) Δωρίον μέλος ἔχειν ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ συνῆγε, καὶ Φρυγίας καὶ Λυδίας, μιξολυδιστὶ καὶ Ἰαστί. See further PRAUSCELLO 2006, pp. 28–33.

²⁷ WEST 1992, pp. 179–180, citing Aristoxenus fr. 81, 84 WEHRLI; Posidonius fr. 471 THEILER; Ps. Plut. *Mus.* 1136f. West perhaps overstates the case when he says that the Dorian mode was common particularly in laments in tragedy; Ps. Plut. says καὶ μέντοι [οὐκ ἡγνόμεν] Ἀριστοξένος] ὅτι καὶ τραγικοὶ οἴκτοί ποτε ἐπὶ τοῦ Δωρίου τρόπου ἐμελωδῆθησαν. The mixolydian seems to have been more appropriate to laments, cfr. Aristox. fr. 81 WEHRLI (and WEST 1992, p. 182). Plat. *Resp.* 398e τινες οὖν θρηγνῶδεις ἁρμονίαι; λέγε μοι . . . Μειξολυδιστί would indicate that the mixolydian was the proper mode for θρηγνῶδεις generally.

²⁸ Plat. *Resp.* 398e; cfr. *PMG* 910 for its use in a skolion.

²⁹ WEST 1992, p. 182, citing *PMG* 878, Aesch. *Pers.* 938.

tious way of saying that the work progressed from a Dorian to a Phrygian modality.³⁰ This can only be described as generic mixing, using a mode (or modes) for an *eidos* of poetry that otherwise was never sung in that mode.³¹

Nor is the above story about Philoxenus an isolated example. In a famous passage in Plato's *Laws* (700d–e) one of the speakers comments on the effects of musical innovation:³²

μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα, προΐόντος τοῦ χρόνου, ἄρχοντες μὲν τῆς ἀμούσου παρανομίας ποιηταὶ ἐγίγνοντο φύσει μὲν ποιητικοί, ἀγνώμονες δὲ περὶ τὸ δίκαιον τῆς Μούσης καὶ τὸ νόμιμον, βακχεύοντες καὶ μᾶλλον τοῦ δέοντος κατεχόμενοι ὑφ' ἡδονῆς, κεραννύντες δὲ θρήνους τε ὕμνοις καὶ παίωνας διθυράμβοις, καὶ αὐλωδίας δὴ ταῦς κιθαρωδίαις μιμούμενοι, καὶ πάντα εἰς πάντα συνάγοντες . . .

But as time went on, composers appeared who inaugurated unmusical rule-breaking, poetic spirits by nature but insensitive to the Muse's rights and principles, running wild and unduly possessed by pleasure, blending dirges with hymns and paeans with dithyrambs, making citharoddy sound like aulody, combining everything with everything . . . (trans. West)

It is most likely that one aspect of this poetic and musical free-for-all that Plato castigates was of a kind with Philoxenus' harmonic manipulation of the dithyrambic genre. There would presumably be various ways for an ingenious poet to mix a dirge with a hymn; one way would be to sing a hymn in the mixolydian mode.

Nor do these developments seem to have been short-lived. Plato, writing towards the middle of the fourth century, seems to regard the innovators as instigating trends that were still very much alive in his day.³³ More explicit is Aristoxenus, writing in the latter half of the fourth century,³⁴ who refers to the effects of these developments 'in our own

³⁰ Ps. Plut. *Mus.* 1142f preserves an analysis of the work (almost certainly derived from Aristoxenus) which shows that it progressed through hypodorian, hypophrygian, Phrygian, Dorian, and mixolydian; see WEST 1992, pp. 364–366.

³¹ In restricted contexts we do find 'free-form' song at an earlier period; note the *τριμελῆς νόμος* of Sacadas of Argos (early 6th century, famed for the *Πυθικὸς νόμος*), which seems to have been a choral (though cfr. BARKER 1984, p. 214, n. 63) song in which the successive strophes were in the Dorian, Phrygian, and Lydian modes; see Ps. Plut. *Mus.* 1134a–b, 1132d with BARKER 1984, pp. 213–214, WEST 1992, p. 214.

³² See also FANTUZZI and HUNTER 2004, pp. 18–19.

³³ Cfr. Plat. *Leg.* 701a καὶ ἀντὶ ἀριστοκρατίας ἐν αὐτῇ θεατροκρατία τις πονηρὰ γέγονεν.

³⁴ The *Suda* (α 3928 ADLER) gives 336 as his *floruit*.

times'.³⁵ As I suggested earlier, such examples of generic transgression in the late fifth and early fourth century are highly significant when we come to assess Hellenistic poetry (and all Hellenistic poetry, not just lyric); in a context where received notions of generic distinction had been transgressed, inverted, or disregarded for more than a century, an epinician in elegiacs might not have been as provocative as we are sometimes led to believe.³⁶

So now we come to the third century and Callimachus, and might reasonably ask how this all fits together. In the Hellenistic period performance poetry was very much alive, at musical *agones* and cult festivals across the Greek world. Dramatic and comic performances were omnipresent, as was lyric poetry. In the inscriptions the genres most often attested are dithyrambs, paeans, prosodia, and hymns, and some of the main centres which have left evidence in the epigraphic record are Delphi (at the *Theoxenia* and *Soteria*), the *Mouseia* at Thespieae in Boeotia, and Delos.³⁷ We even have attestation for performance of dithyrambs and tragedy from third-century Cyrene, the birthplace of Callimachus.³⁸ Thus it would be salutary to remember that Hellenistic poetry in general was forged not only in the shadow of archaic and classical poetry, but against the backdrop of a very active musical and performance culture in its own day.

To proceed with an argument from inference, it makes *prima facie* sense that a skilled and serious poet would not have sympathy with an εἶδος which subordinated poetry to music, and whose poetry was replete with bombastic compound neologisms. And in Callimachus we find an almost complete avoidance of anything that might be associated with the poets of the New Music.³⁹ As noted above, their innovations were particularly associated with the dithyramb and citharodic nome; neither of these genres have left a trace in the poetry of Callimachus—while a

³⁵ Ap. Ps. Plut. *Mus.* 1140e ἐπὶ μέντοι τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς χρόνων τοσοῦτον ἐπιδέδωκε τὸ τῆς διαφθορᾶς εἶδος . . .

³⁶ Regarding such poems as the *Victoria Berenices* (SH 254–68c) or the *Hippika* in the New Posidippus as isolated experiments is to ignore both literary history and contemporary context. As a healthy corrective see CAMERON 1992.

³⁷ Victor lists from the Delphic *Soteria*: SGDI 2563–2566; see also NACHTERGAEL 1977, p. 410. Paeans and prosodia at the *Theoxenia*: FD III, 2, 78. *Mouseia* at Thespieae: SCHACHTER 1994, MANIERI 2009. Festivals at Delos: IG IX², 105–134; see also RINGWOOD 1933.

³⁸ SEG IX, 13 and XLVIII, 2052; see CECCARELLI and MILANEZI 2007.

³⁹ This is furthermore true for a fair amount of Hellenistic poetry, though Theocritus for example makes use of Timotheus, cfr. HORDERN 2002, pp. 20–21.

genre such as the paeon, which was not cultivated by the innovators, has certainly influenced such poems as Callimachus' *Hymn to Apollo* and the *Branchus* (fr. 229).⁴⁰ In metrical practice, the gulf is again wide. It has long been noted that the bulk of 'high' Hellenistic lyric is written *κατὰ στίχον*.⁴¹ The reasons for this are manifold, and would of course include the novelty of stichic lyric metres, as well as the possible absence of a musically accompanied performance context.⁴² But I would suggest that stichic lyric cola would also have had the advantage of being unlike anything that might be heard in the auditoria, unlike anything that might suggest so poetically impoverished a genre as the contemporary dithyramb.

As we have already noted, many of the developments in music, metre, and language associated with the New Music are particularly connected with dithyramb and tragedy. A particular feature of later tragedy (and comedy) was the marginalisation of the chorus, with sung arias and musical interludes taking the place of the traditional choral ode. This can be seen as a development of the substitution of *ἀναβολαί* for antistrophes attested for the poets of the New Music. Tragedy was, along with the dithyramb, the genre of Dionysus, and by the early third century both were largely the preserve of the artists of Dionysus.⁴³ In this context a passage from the prologue to Callimachus' *Aetia* is particularly instructive, fr. 1, 29–32:

Ἰν· ἐνὶ τοῖς γὰρ αἰείδομεν οἱ λιγὺν ἦχον
τέττιγος, θῆρορυν δ' οὐκ ἐφίλησαν ὄνων.
θηρὶ μὲν οὐατόεντι πανείκελον ὀγκήσαιτο
ἄλλος . . .

⁴⁰ For the *Hymn to Apollo* as a 'quasi-paeanic' poem, cfr. RUTHERFORD 2001, pp. 128–130. The *Branchus*, a stichic lyric hymn addressed to Didymean Apollo and Zeus, can hardly be disassociated from the paeans sung by the Milesian Molpoi in procession to the sanctuary at Didyma each year (for which see the Molpoi decree, *Milet* 1, 3, 133 and GORMAN 2001, pp. 176–186). On the paeon-refrain as a generic marker for Callimachus, cfr. *P. Oxy.* 2368, detailing a dispute over the classification of Bacchyl. 23. Aristarchus thought it was a dithyramb due to its narrative, Callimachus a paeon due to the refrain; see KÄPPEL and KANNICHT 1988, RUTHERFORD 2001, pp. 97–99.

⁴¹ Indeed many metres that are attested in earlier poetry as isolated cola but are used stichichly in the Hellenistic period often have their 'discovery' attributed to a particular Hellenistic poet in whom the metre was prominent, such as the Phalaecan hendecasyllable. This phenomenon was noted by MAAS 1962, p. 11, § 15.

⁴² Though it should not be too readily assumed that none of the Hellenistic lyric we have was performed in some way; sources like Theoc. 15 should remind us that contemporary poetry was still performed in 3rd century Alexandria. CAMERON 1995 has made persuasive arguments for performance contexts for various specimens of Hellenistic poetry.

⁴³ See generally PICKARD-CAMBRIDGE 1968, pp. 279–330, WEST 1992, pp. 374–376. Cfr. the prominence of the artists of Dionysus in the grand procession of Ptolemy Philadelphus, with RICE 1983.

I sing for those who [love] the clear voice of the cicada, and have no care for the din of donkeys. Let someone else bray like the long-eared one . . .

Callimachus assimilates his poetry to the singing of the cicada, an insect associated with the Muses and Apollo (cfr. Plat. *Phaedr.* 259b–d), while rejecting the braying of the donkey, the favourite and symbolic animal of Dionysus.⁴⁴ This passage from the *Aetia* can be further explicated by two passages from Callimachus' *Iambi*. At fr. 192, 12–13 (*Ia.* 2) Callimachus takes aim at tragic actors⁴⁵:

οἱ δὲ τραγῳδοὶ τῶν θάλασσαν οἰκεύντων
ἔχουσι φωνήν

Tragic actors have the voice of those who inhabit the sea

That the comparison with sea creatures signifies unpleasantness of voice, rather than simply lack of voice,⁴⁶ seems to be confirmed by a passage in Seneca's *Apocolocyntosis* (5), where the emperor Claudius is said to have *vocem nullius terrestris animalis sed qualis esse marinis beluis solet, raucam et implicatam*, 'the voice of no terrestrial animal but such as is found among beasts of the deep, harsh and inarticulate'.⁴⁷ This same negative assessment of the aural quality of tragedy is evident at fr. 215, an unplaced fragment from an *Iambus*, ἥτις τραγῳδὸς μοῦσα ληκυθίζουσα, 'some bellowing tragic Muse.' This tragic Muse, bellowing like someone speaking into a lekythos,⁴⁸ can hardly be the Muse that Callimachus elsewhere cultivates. Lastly, the tragic actor is again disparaged at fr. 219 οὐ πρῶν μὲν ἡμῖν ὁ τραγῳδὸς ἤγειρε, 'the tragic actor didn't rouse us yesterday.' We don't know who the speaker of the line is, but the sentiment is in line with what we find elsewhere in Callimachus regarding tragic poetry, while πρῶν, 'yesterday', might suggest a contemporary setting for the passage the line comes from.

⁴⁴ See AMBÜHL 1995, pp. 211–212. I would not be alone in questioning the *Suda*'s statement that Callimachus wrote tragedies and comedies.

⁴⁵ The lines certainly refer to the bombast of contemporary tragic actors (not tragic poets, cfr. J. and L. ROBERT, *REG* 71 [1958], 223), and specifically its aural quality (thus CAMERON 1995, p. 61), rather than repudiating tragedy generally (thus KERKHECKER 1999, p. 54, n. 37).

⁴⁶ Thus e.g. KERKHECKER 1999, pp. 54–58, who evaluates many previous arguments. Cfr. Clearchus *ap.* Athen. 8, 347f, where Stratonice criticises a poetic performance by Propis, calling him an ἰχθύς on account of his ἀφωνία, a reference I owe to Pauline LeVen's paper in this volume.

⁴⁷ *Raucus* is often used of loud and harsh-sounding musical instruments, such as cymbals and war trumpets, see *OLD* s.v.

⁴⁸ A description immediately suggestive of Seneca's *raucam et implicatam*.

In one of his epigrams (7 Pf. = A.P. 9, 565) Callimachus suggests that the genres of Dionysus might lead to immediate popular renown, but do little to ensure one's continuing fame:

Ἦλθε Θεαίτητος καθαρὴν ὁδὸν· εἰ δ' ἐπὶ κισσόν
τὸν τεὸν οὐχ αὖτη, Βάκχε, κέλευθος ἄγει,
ἄλλων μὲν κήρυκες ἐπὶ βραχὺν οὖνομα καιρόν
φθέγγονται, κείνου δ' Ἑλλάς ἀεὶ σοφίην.

Theaitetos travelled a pure road, even if that path doesn't lead to your ivy, Bacchus—the heralds will proclaim the names of others for a short while, but his art Hellas will proclaim forever.

The καθαρὴν ὁδὸν, which is juxtaposed with the path that leads to Bacchus' crown, immediately suggests the κελεύθους / ἀτρίπτουζ at *Aetia* 1, 27–28 which Apollo advised the young Callimachus to follow. In *Epigram* 7 we find the same tension between the genres of Dionysus and what appears to be the path of Apollo, respectively repudiated and endorsed by Callimachus in the *Aetia* prologue.

Lastly we come to fr. 604 which, to be fully appreciated, needs to be read in its quotation context, Σ EM Aristoph. *Nub.* 333a:

οἱ παλαιοὶ διαφθορὰν μουσικῆς ἡγοῦντο εἶναι τοὺς διθυράμβους . . . καὶ
Καλλίμαχος δὲ πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἀποτεινόμενος οὕτω πως αὐτῶν καθάπτεται·
νόθαι δ' ἦνθησαν αἰοδαί

The ancients considered the dithyramb to be the ruin of music . . . and Callimachus alluding to them thus upbraids them: 'base-born songs flourished.'

The scholiast makes it clear that Callimachus is referring to dithyramb.⁴⁹ The use of νόθαι here is intriguing—νόθος has two primary meanings, the first base-born, i.e. of a concubine or slave, and the second spurious or counterfeit (Porphyry even uses it of a spurious literary work, *Vit. Plot.* 16, 15 HENRY-SCHWYZER). One might be tempted to see a reference to the lack of poetic legitimacy of the dithyramb—like the Telchines of the *Aetia* prologue, contemporary dithyrambic poets are no friends of the Muses, and thus their songs are 'illegitimate', born of poets that have not been anointed by the Muses. And we should not be surprised if it were for the very reasons outlined above, the lack of poetic interest, a genre where words and poetry were subjugated to musical extravagance and visual display, that Callimachus—and in his wake much of high Hellenistic poetry—disavows the dithyramb, the tragic Muse, and Dionysiac poetry generally—the poetry that had been at the forefront of musical develop-

⁴⁹ The scholiast is otherwise well informed, telling us that Aristoph. *Nub.* 333 was directed against Cinesias, Philoxenus, and Timotheus (see n. 8 above).

ment for the previous 150 or so years, and which dominated the theatres and festivals of the third-century world.

University of Oxford
alexander.dale@keble.oxon.org

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- AMBÜHL 1995 A. AMBÜHL, 'Callimachus and the Arcadian Asses. The Aitia Prologue and a Lemma in the London Scholion', *Zeitschr. Papyr. u. Epigr.* 105, 1995, pp. 209–213.
- BARKER 1984 A. BARKER, *Greek Musical Writings* vol. 1, *The Musician and his Art*, Cambridge 1984.
- CAMERON 1992 A. CAMERON, 'Genre and Style in Callimachus', *Trans. Am. Philol. Assoc.* 122, 1992, pp. 305–312.
- CAMERON 1995 A. CAMERON, *Callimachus and his Critics*, Princeton 1995.
- CECCARELLI and MILANEZI 2007 P. CECCARELLI and S. MILANEZI, 'Dithyramb, Tragedy – and Cyrene', in P. WILSON (ed.), *The Greek Theatre and Festivals*, Oxford 2007, pp. 185–214.
- FANTUZZI and HUNTER 2004 M. FANTUZZI and R. L. HUNTER, *Tradition and Innovation in Hellenistic Poetry*, Cambridge 2004.
- GORMAN 2001 V. B. GORMAN, *Miletos: the Ornament of Ionia*, Ann Arbor 2001.
- HAMILTON 1990 R. HAMILTON, 'The Pindaric Dithyramb', *Harv. Stud. Class. Philol.* 93, 1990, pp. 211–222.
- HARVIE 1955 A. E. HARVIE, 'The Classification of Greek Lyric Poetry', *Class. Quart.* (n.s.) 5, 1955, pp. 157–175.
- HORDERN 2002 J. HORDERN, *The Fragments of Timotheus of Miletus*, Oxford 2002.
- KÄPPEL and KANNICHT 1988 L. KÄPPEL and R. KANNICHT, 'Noch einmal zur Frage "Dithyrambos oder Paian?" im Bakchylideskommentar P. Oxy. 23. 2368', *Zeitschr. Papyr. u. Epigr.* 73, 1988, pp. 19–24.
- KERKHECKER 1999 A. KERKHECKER, *Callimachus' Book of Iambi*, Oxford 1999.
- MANIERI 2009 A. MANIERI, *Agoni poetico musicali nella Grecia antica*, 1. *Beozia*, Pisa-Roma 2009.
- MASS 1962 P. MASS, *Greek Metre*, Oxford 1962.
- NACHTERGAEL 1977 G. NACHTERGAEL, *Les Galates en Grèce et les Sôtéria de Delphes*, Bruxelles 1977.

- NIKITINSKI 1998 O. NIKITINSKI, 'Kallimachos und die Tragodoi: zu Kallimachos fr. 192, 12–13', *Zeitschr. Papyr. u. Epigr.* 122, 1998, pp. 41–46.
- PICKARD-CAMBRIDGE 1927 A. W. PICKARD-CAMBRIDGE, *Dithyramb, Tragedy, and Comedy*, Oxford 1927.
- PICKARD-CAMBRIDGE 1968 A. W. PICKARD-CAMBRIDGE, *The Dramatic Festivals of Athens*, rev. J. GOULD and D. M. LEWIS, Oxford 1968².
- PRAUSCELLO 2006 L. PRAUSCELLO, *Singing Alexandria. Music Between Practice and Textual Transmission*, Leiden-Boston 2006.
- RHODE 1878 E. RHODE, 'Γέγρονε in dem Biographica des Suidas', *Rhein. Mus.* 33, 1878, pp. 161–220.
- RICE 1983 E. E. RICE, *The Grand Procession of Ptolemy Philadelphus*, Oxford 1983.
- RINGWOOD 1933 I. RINGWOOD, 'Local Festivals at Delos', *Am. Journ. Archaeol.* 37, 1933, pp. 452–458.
- RUTHERFORD 2001 I. C. RUTHERFORD, *Pindar's Paeans*, Oxford 2001.
- SCHACHTER 1994 A. SCHACHTER, *The Cults of Boiotia*, vol. 3, *Potnia to Zeus*, London 1994.
- SCHÖNEWOLF 1938 H. SCHÖNEWOLF, *Der jungattische Dithyrambos*. Diss. Giessen 1938.
- SEAFORD 1977–1978 R. SEAFORD, 'The Hyperchorema of Pratinas', *Maia* 29–30, 1977–1978, pp. 81–94.
- WEST 1982 M. L. WEST, 'Metrical analyses: Timotheus and Others', *Zeitschr. Papyr. u. Epigr.* 45, 1982, pp. 1–13.
- WEST 1983 M. L. WEST, *Greek Metre*, Oxford 1983.
- WEST 1992 M. L. WEST, *Ancient Greek Music*, Oxford 1992.
- WINNINGTON-INGRAM 1936 R. P. WINNINGTON-INGRAM, *Mode in Ancient Greek Music*, Cambridge 1936.

